What is a successful program review?

One where the program has (1) examined data (evidence) for the past three years related to numerous metrics, (2) conducted an analysis of what the data mean which (3) results in a clear understanding of whether the program meets expectations or does not meet expectations in terms of programmatic quality, productivity, and viability, and (4) clearly ‘makes the case’ to support their conclusions in the narrative sections of the Reporting Vehicle.
Focused on Programmatic Improvement

• The ultimate goal of program review is to facilitate evidence-based decision-making resulting in strategies for improvement of the program.

• Therefore, if analysis of the evidence has revealed a weakness, consider developing a program objective to specifically address the identified weakness from which specific strategies would then be developed.

As the evidence shows, first-time pass rates on the national certification exam averaged 60% for the past three years compared to an average of 75% for all test-takers. Consequently, the program has developed a new program objective: Increase the first-time pass rates on the national certification exam by 15 percentage points within the next three years.
Comments on the Comprehensive Program Review Reporting Vehicle
The University System of Georgia developed the “Reporting Vehicle” for comprehensive program review: one tailored for undergraduate programs and one for graduate programs.

Programs will need to summarize the results of their last program review since the ultimate purpose is to assess the degree of improvement in the program since the last review and set a plan for the next few years to ensure continued improvement.

The Reporting Vehicle is then divided into several sections:
- Indicators of Quality
  - Student and faculty (faculty also assesses productivity)
- Curricular Alignment and Currency to the Discipline
- Indicators of Viability
- Indicators of Productivity
Reporting Vehicle

• Each section has numerous metrics that programs will need to complete and use in their analysis (the narrative sections).

• Much of the data can be pulled from the Office of Institutional Research’s website at:
  • [http://em.georgiasouthern.edu/ir/student-enrollment-data/](http://em.georgiasouthern.edu/ir/student-enrollment-data/) (Statesboro enrollment data by headcount, class, gender, full- or part-time, ethnicity, credit hours, etc.)
  • [http://em.georgiasouthern.edu/ir/rpg_deg/](http://em.georgiasouthern.edu/ir/rpg_deg/) (Retention, Progression, and Graduation Data)
  • Data not found can be requested at: [http://em.georgiasouthern.edu/ir/rf/](http://em.georgiasouthern.edu/ir/rf/).

• Departments will have collected other data through their annual assessment reports and Departmental Annual Reports.

• If the program uses other metrics to determine quality, productivity, and viability, they may substitute those metrics in the narrative discussion relevant to that section.
Narrative Sections

Begin each narrative section with a discussion of the program’s goals and objectives related to that particular section, recognizing that program objectives are different than student learning objectives or departmental objectives. This discussion sets the context for the rest of the analysis.

Exemplar:
Goal: Prepare program graduates to be successful entry-level registered dietitians in the fields of community nutrition or school nutrition.

Objective:
• Over a five-year period, 80% or more of interns enrolled in the dietetic internship program will complete all program requirements within 150% of the time planned for completion (12 months x 150% = 18 months).
• Over a five-year period, the first-time pass rates for program graduates taking the registration examination (for dietitians) will be at least 80%.
• Over a five-year period, 80% or more of program graduates who sought dietetics employment will be employed within 12 months of program completion.
• Over a five-year period, 80% or more of program graduates will be rated as satisfactory by employers.
Narrative Sections

Be sure to answer all of the questions in each narrative section, citing the relevant data to support your conclusions.

Indicate whether your program objective was met, partially met, or not met and what you may change to meet the objective in the future.

Be sure to include any changes the program has made as a result of the findings to improve the program’s goals and objectives – “closing the loop.”

What do your findings indicate about your program’s quality, productivity, and/or viability?
Analysis of Student Quality/Productivity

1. How does your program measure student quality of incoming, currently enrolled, and graduating students? What are the metrics you use?
2. What is the quality of your students (consider analyzing trends over time)? How has the program improved in this area?
3. How does the quality of your students compare to your peer/aspirational peer programs?
4. What does the quality of your students say about the overall quality of your program?

1. What are the program’s retention and graduation rates (consider analyzing trends over time)?
2. How do these rates compare to your peer/aspirational peer programs?
3. What do these data tell you about the productivity and viability of the program?

1. How does your program define student diversity (e.g., race, gender, discipline interest)?
2. What is the diversity of your students (consider analyzing trends over time)?
3. How does the diversity of your students compare to your peer/aspirational peer programs?
4. What do these data tell you about the quality and productivity of your program?
Analysis of Faculty Quality and Productivity

• How does your program define quality teaching, productive teaching? What measures do you use to evaluate (e.g., peer evaluations, self-evaluations, descriptions of new course developments or revisions, conferences attended on SoTL, etc.)? What do the data tell you about the quality of the program’s teaching, the productivity of the program’s teaching?

• How does your program define quality scholarship/creative activity, productive scholarship/creative activity? What measures do you use to evaluate? What do the data tell you about the quality of the program’s scholarship/creative activity, the productivity of the program’s scholarship/creative activity?

• How does your program define quality service, productive service? What measures do you use to evaluate? What do the data tell you about the quality of the program’s teaching, the productivity of the program’s teaching?
Curricular Alignment and Currency to the Discipline

- What are your *student learning objectives* and what are the findings?

- Consider using a curriculum map to demonstrate how the curriculum is sequenced to support attainment of student learning objectives.

- Consider discipline trends and how these may factor into your analysis.

- What changes to the curriculum have been made as a result of your findings?

- What do your curriculum findings tell you about the quality, productivity, and viability of the program?
Analysis of Program Viability

• How does your program define viability? What are the program’s goals and objectives related to viability?

• What other measures/evidence (in addition to internal demand) do you use to determine the program’s viability?

• How has the program’s viability improved? What is the program’s plan for continued improvement?
Contextual Closing Narrative

• Provides a summary of the conclusions reached as a consequence of having undertaken the analysis required in writing the self-study document.

• Be sure to include a determination of whether the program:
  Meets Expectations
  1. Program is critical to the institutional mission and will be retained; OR
  2. Program is critical to the institutional mission and is in a growing or a high demand field and thus will be enhanced.

  Does Not Meet Expectations
  1. Program will be placed on monitoring; OR
  2. Program will undergo substantive curricular revisions; OR
  3. Program will be deactivated; OR
  4. Program will be voluntarily terminated; OR
  5. Other (identify)
Comments on Comprehensive Program Process
Levels of Review

• Comprehensive Program Review begins at the program level. After gathering the data, program faculty should meet to discuss what the data reveal about the quality, productivity, and viability of their program and what new efforts are needed to move the program in the desired direction.

• Following these conversations, an editor is assigned to write the narrative sections of the Reporting Vehicle, keeping in mind that the document will be read at multiple levels and by individuals not familiar with the discipline.

• The final document is presented and discussed to the full departmental faculty - especially if the program is one of many in the department.

• After review by the departmental faculty, the document is reviewed by the department chair who writes a memorandum summarizing his separate assessment of the program.
Levels of Review

- The Reporting Vehicle along with the department chair’s separate assessment is conveyed to the dean or his/her designee for review. The dean or his/her designee also writes a separate memorandum assessing the program. *Note: the dean’s level is the last level at which assessment of quality, productivity, and viability is based on the actual program versus the program’s report.*

- The dean submits the Reporting Vehicle and the department chair’s memorandum and the dean’s memorandum to the Provost’s Office (no later than February 1st) which forwards the materials to either the Undergraduate or Graduate Committees, as applicable.

- Beginning at the university-level of review, all further assessments are made on the quality of the program review report as opposed to the actual program, based upon the completed Reporting Vehicle – the rationale being that the reviewers are not familiar with the actual program and therefore are relying entirely upon the program’s report. A well-documented and well-written report will generally mean that the program’s assessment accurately reflects the reality of the program.
Levels of Review

• The Undergraduate and Graduate Committees convey their findings to the Provost’s Office (after their April meetings).

• Through the minutes of the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees, results are also conveyed to Faculty Senate for endorsement (at their June meeting).

• Faculty Senate endorsements are reviewed by the Provost and then the President, which constitutes the final level of institutional review and approval.

• The Provost’s Office communicates the results of the university-level review back to the programs through the department chair, copying the dean’s office.

• Results are also communicated to the University System of Georgia to comply with Board of Regents policy.
Timeline

• Programs should begin the review process as early in the fall semester as possible.

• The completed Reporting Vehicle along with the department chair’s and dean’s separate assessments are due to the Provost’s Office no later than February 1, 2019.

• The Undergraduate and Graduate Committees will finalize their review at their April meetings, using the Evaluative Rubric.

• Feedback based upon these committees’ review will be communicated back to the programs shortly thereafter and forwarded to the University System Office.

• Programs that score 31 or less on the Evaluative Rubric will be asked to submit a revised report by August 1, 2019 to the Provost’s Office.
Questions?